

REMARKS

15 The Office Action dated August 3, 2006, has been reviewed carefully and the ap-
plication has been amended in a sincere effort to place it in condition for allowance.

Election/Restriction

As noted by the Examiner, the Applicant has elected to prosecute the invention of Group I, including claims 1-6, without traverse. Accordingly, claims 7-14 have been cancelled herein, without prejudice, and Applicant reserves the right to present those claims in a continuation or divisional application.

Priority

Applicant claims priority for any matter disclosed in the originally filed the parent case.

25 *Drawings*

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner for various reasons and the Applicant has the following comments:

Items 220, 223¹ and 76 were typographical errors in the Specification and appropriate correction has been made to the Specification, as set forth in the above amendment to Page 9. It is believed that the Specification now conforms to the drawings as to those matters.

With respect to item 1015, this item has been added to Fig. 10B and a replacement sheet is being filed herewith for the consideration of the Examiner. Item 1016 is also shown in Fig. 10B, which is the roller assembly referred to in the Specification on
35 Page 12, lines 2 – 5.

With respect to item 1105, the flexible bladder 1105 is shown in Fig. 11 and is discussed in the Specification at Page 13, line 20. We have used collapsible bag and flexible bladder interchangeably. All objections set forth in Paragraph 11 of the Office Action have thus been addressed. The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner
40 pointing out these matters.

With respect to the matters raised in Paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the reference characters mentioned do not appear to be in the Figures. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if there is a further objection in this regard.

Objection to the Specification

45 The Abstract has been amended herein and rewritten to ensure that it contains less than 150 words.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Published Patent Application No. 2003/0082427 (“Prasad”).

50 Applicant’s invention as set forth in representative independent claim 1, as amended, comprises in part:

A liquid feed fuel cell system comprising:

- (A) a direct oxidation fuel cell including a membrane electrode assembly;
- 55 (B) a source of liquid fuel; and
- (C) a fuel container coupled with said fuel cell, including:
 - (i) a first inner bladder being substantially fully expanded upon being filled with liquid fuel, and having a fuel outlet conduit to supply liquid fuel to said direct oxidation fuel cell; and
 - 60 (ii) *a second inner bladder for receiving effluent from said fuel cell through an effluent inlet leading from said fuel cell into said fuel container, said second inner bladder being disposed directly adjacent to said first inner bladder such that as effluent is received from the fuel cell, the second inner bladder expands displacing fuel from*
 - 65 *said first inner bladder to deliver fuel to said fuel cell.*

In contrast, Prasad teaches the use of a movable barrier 40 configured to move as fuel is removed from fuel solution outlet 28 simultaneously reducing the volume of fuel storage area 24 and increasing the volume of waste storage area 26. (Paragraph 26) Because Prasad requires this movable barrier, the design also requires pressurizer 80 (Fig. 2) disposed within the waste storage area 26 to urge against the movable barrier 40.

Applicant's Specification describes the opposite by teaching that "the effluent bladder 1305b is not under the application of force because the effluent is desirably entering into the bladder, rather than being expressed from it." Specification page 15, line 31 through Page 16, line 1).

In order to enhance the claim to better claim the invention and to clarify these distinctions, claim 1 has been amended to recite that *said second inner bladder being disposed directly adjacent to said first inner bladder such that as effluent is received from the fuel cell, the second inner bladder expands displacing fuel from said first inner bladder to deliver fuel to said fuel cell.*

Absent this feature of Applicant's claimed invention, Prasad cannot have anticipated the invention as claimed in the amended independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned in order to further the prosecution of this application in any respect.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rita M. Rooney/

Rita M. Rooney
Reg. No. 30,585
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500